

REMARKS

Claims 11-28 were pending in the application with claims 11-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Walker et al.* (5,192,929). Claims 19 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for containing the phrase “such as.” It is submitted that the claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 is drawn to a method of indirectly determining a tire pressure loss by determining one or more parameters used to determine pressure loss of a motor vehicle wheel, wherein the one or more parameters is derived from a wheel acceleration.

It is submitted that none of the cited references teach, suggest or disclose, either alone or in combination, the embodiment recited in claim 11. For example, *Walker et al.* fails to disclose or suggest a deriving a parameter from a wheel acceleration.

Walker et al. disclose (col. 3, lines 24-43) determining “the angular velocities of all four wheels at the same instant” and using the four wheel velocities to calculate lateral and longitudinal vehicle acceleration. This vehicle acceleration is used to determine if the front wheels or the rear wheels deviate from vehicle speed. In order to determine which wheel has suffered a pressure loss, each wheel **velocity** is compared against the average (co. 4, lines 1-8). However, *Walker et al.* does not disclose that a pressure loss is derived from a wheel acceleration.

Therefore, *Walker et al.* fails to teach or suggest determining a parameter related to acceleration of a wheel, as claimed in claim 11. For example, *Walker et al.* does not teach or suggest determining a parameter based on acceleration of a wheel. The advantage of using a wheel acceleration as opposed to wheel speed and vehicle acceleration is that the wheels may have an acceleration that is different than the vehicle acceleration. In the method taught by *Walker et al.*, each

wheel speed is compared against the average wheel speed to determine which tire has suffered a pressure loss. But, if two or more wheels have suffered a pressure loss, the average wheel speed will be affected and the system may not detect that two (or more) wheels have a pressure loss. Applicants' method allows for the determination of each wheel pressure loss, regardless of the number of wheels that suffer a pressure loss.

Claim 20 is drawn to a computer program product for indirectly detecting pressure loss on a motor vehicle wheel. The program product includes a code segment for determining one or more parameters used to determine pressure loss of a motor vehicle wheel, wherein the one or more parameters is derived from a wheel acceleration.

It is submitted that none of the cited references teach, suggest or disclose, either alone or in combination, the embodiment recited in claim 20. For example, *Walker et al.* fails to disclose or suggest a deriving a parameter from a wheel acceleration.

Walker et al. disclose (col. 3, lines 24-43) determining "the angular velocities of all four wheels at the same instant" and using the four wheel velocities to calculate lateral and longitudinal vehicle acceleration. This vehicle acceleration is used to determine if the front wheels or the rear wheels deviate from vehicle speed. In order to determine which wheel has suffered a pressure loss, each wheel **velocity** is compared against the average (co. 4, lines 1-8). However, *Walker et al.* does not disclose that a pressure loss is derived from a wheel acceleration.

Therefore, *Walker et al.* fails to teach or suggest a program code for determining parameter including an acceleration of wheel of claim 20. For example, *Walker et al.* does not teach or suggest determining a parameter based on acceleration of a wheel. The advantage of using a wheel acceleration as opposed to wheel speed and vehicle acceleration is that the wheels may have an acceleration that is different than the vehicle acceleration. In the method taught by *Walker et al.*, each wheel speed is compared against the average wheel speed to

determine which tire has suffered a pressure loss. But, if two or more wheels have suffered a pressure loss, the average wheel speed will be affected and the system may not detect that two (or more) wheels have a pressure loss. Applicants' method allows for the determination of each wheel pressure loss, regardless of the number of wheels that suffer a pressure loss.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 20 are patentable over the cited references. Claims 12-19 and 21-28 depend from claims 11 and 20 and therefore are submitted to be patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons and for the further features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-28 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 11-28 is earnestly submitted.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of the Application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned agent to set up such conference.

Applicants believe no additional fees are due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2570, under Order No. AP10597, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

/Craig Hallacher/

Craig A. Hallacher
Registration No. 54,896
Continental Teves, Inc.
One Continental Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6518
Agent for Applicants